

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region

May 16, 2003

ITEM: 8

SUBJECT: Waste Discharge Requirements for The Colonies Partners, LP, "The Colonies at San Antonio" Project, Campus Avenue at 19th Street, Upland, San Bernardino County – Order No. R8-2003-0025

DISCUSSION:

The Colonies Partners, LP (hereinafter, discharger) proposes to complete construction of "The Colonies at San Antonio" in the City of Upland, San Bernardino County (N34° 07', W117° 37') (Attachment A). The project is a mixed-use development that encompasses approximately 450 acres and includes a combination of single family residences, luxury attached dwellings, neighborhood and commercial facilities, roadways, drainage and flood control features, and open space.

On June 4, 1999, Board staff waived waste discharge requirements and Clean Water Act Section 401 certification, with conditions, for the first phase of the project in its easternmost portion. This proposed Order prescribes waste discharge requirements for fill activities that have been and will be conducted during the second and final phase of the project. These fill activities have affected and will affect beneficial uses of isolated surface waters, which are waters of the state but are currently considered outside the jurisdiction of the U.S Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). Therefore, a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit is not being required by the ACOE, and no Section 401 water quality standards certification is necessary.

The project site is bounded by the Holiday Rock gravel mining operation located immediately to the north of the 210 Freeway; by Colonies Parkway and Tanglewood Avenue to the east; by Campus Avenue to the west; and by residences and a golf course to the south (Attachment B). An east-west arterial road, 19th Street, currently bisects the site into northern and southern portions. South of 19th Street, sand and gravel mining activities took place on the site in two major pits separated by an earthen levee. The largest pit, located on the north side of the levee, is referred to as Basin 6 and the pit on the south side of the levee is referred to as Basin 7.

The site overlies the Cucamonga Groundwater Subbasin, which is used as a source of supply by water purveyors, including the Cucamonga County Water District and the San Antonio Water Company. Asserting the existence and viability of certain easements on the site, San Antonio Water Company has diverted, and continues to divert, flows from San Antonio Creek to serve its shareholders. Surplus water is discharged by the San Antonio Water Company into Basin 6 for groundwater recharge purposes. These easements and the rights of the San Antonio Water Company to continue such recharge operations are the subject of pending litigation between the San Antonio Water Company and the discharger. Cucamonga County Water District, which has no easement to spread water but which extracts from the Cucamonga Groundwater Subbasin, has intervened in the pending litigation. A court hearing to resolve the litigation is scheduled for June 2, 2003. The results of this litigation may materially affect the final design of the project.

Storm and low-flow runoff from a 2,400-acre urban watershed (part of the City of Upland and unincorporated County of San Bernardino) and from a segment of the 210 Freeway also enter Basin 6 from the west via the 19th and 20th Street storm drains.

The basins support diverse wildlife habitat. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) identified a total of 29 acres of wildlife habitat in the basins, comprised of willow/mulefat scrub, marsh, riparian, and intermittent pond ecotypes.

In order to develop the project, the discharger proposes to conduct construction activities throughout Basins 6 and 7. Some unauthorized grading has already occurred (see discussion below). The specific plan for the project anticipates that as much as 5 million cubic yards of material from Basin 6 will be excavated and 4.7 million cubic yards of fill will be emplaced. While beneficial uses for these isolated waters are not specifically listed in the Basin Plan, the beneficial uses of the wetlands and other habitat types in Basins 6 and 7 that will be impacted by the proposed construction activities include wildlife habitat (WILD), warm freshwater habitat (WARM), groundwater recharge (GWR), and non-contact water recreation (REC2). Between 1997 and 2002, various surveys were conducted to inventory biological resources and to perform focused searches for threatened and endangered species. No threatened or endangered species were found, and a Biological Opinion is not required. The City of Upland certified an environmental impact report for the project on September 24, 2002. On November 12, 2002, CDFG issued a streambed alteration agreement for the project, including requirements for mitigation of the loss of the 29 acres of habitat in Basins 6 and 7¹.

Prior to October 2002, earth-moving activities took place within Basin 6 that impacted three to five acres of wetlands and associated habitat (and therefore beneficial uses of waters of the state), without prior notification of and authorization by the Regional Board². On November 5, 2002, to prevent further destruction of wetland resources on the site, Board staff issued an order to stop further work on the project. On December 10, 2002, the discharger submitted a report of waste discharge (ROWD) in order to obtain appropriate waste discharge requirements for all project activities at the site that could affect beneficial uses and to resume work on the site. This Order proposes waste discharge requirements to address the impacts of the project on waters of the state, including all prior unauthorized activities, and it authorizes lifting of the stop work order and resumption of construction work on the project.

The final project design now proposed by the discharger includes a dedicated open space area wherein mitigation for the impacts of the project on beneficial uses is to be implemented. The discharger proposes the construction of an approximately 60-acre basin (Basin A) (see

¹ As a matter of information, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) advised the discharger that due to embankment changes at Basin 6, the Basin is now under State jurisdiction for dam safety. Further, DWR advised the discharger that the dam was being operated and maintained without approval by DWR, a violation of Section 6077 of the California Water Code. The discharger proposes to rectify the violation by the construction of a new breach in the embankment, eliminating water storage.

² The discharger had been advised by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (letter dated November 7, 2001) that appropriate notification of the Regional Board should be made to determine what approval might be required.

Attachment C, Planning Area 16³), superimposed over the existing Basin 6, that will include wetlands (Zone 1, approximately 12 acres), riparian habitat (Zone 2, approximately 13 acres), open ponds (2 acres), and native upland shrub vegetation (32 acres) (Attachment C1). Additionally, appropriate native vegetation, including riparian associations, is proposed to be established along the 8.5-acre, narrow corridor ("gooseneck") that will convey stormwater overflow from the developed open space area to an existing detention basin (Basin B) adjacent to Cucamonga Creek. Basin A will also be used for flood control purposes by the County of San Bernardino Flood Control District. The discharger has committed to the completion of mass grading of Basin A by September 4, 2004. The discharger has also committed to the timely implementation, once mass grading is complete, of interim mitigation, consisting of vegetating the entire Basin with a range of species suited to the habitats to be included in the final basin design. As stated above, the final design of the project is contingent on the results of pending litigation. If the water purveyors prevail in their argument that their use of the site for groundwater recharge purposes must be protected, then the final design may need to be modified accordingly.

This Order addresses both possible outcomes of the pending litigation. In the event that the discharger prevails, the Order requires the discharger to submit for approval by the Executive Officer a proposed plan and schedule for mass grading, fine grading and completion of the project, and the implementation of both short- and long- term mitigation. The schedule is to reflect the concurrent implementation of mitigation as the development proceeds, to the greatest extent feasible. This plan must also include a specific proposal whereby the discharger proposes to guarantee completion of agreed-upon mitigation. Finally, the discharger is required to submit a proposed plan for the monitoring and maintenance of both short- and long-term mitigation, and to identify the mechanism proposed to assure funding for these activities.

In the event that the San Antonio Water Company prevails in the litigation, this Order requires that the discharger submit a proposed plan and schedule for project implementation, for approval by the Regional Board, that insures that any court-ordered directives regarding protection of groundwater recharge rights are fully implemented. Again, this plan and schedule must reflect concurrent implementation of mitigation as the development proceeds, to the greatest extent feasible. This plan must also include a specific proposal whereby the discharger will guarantee completion of the agreed-upon mitigation. The discharger is also required to submit a proposed plan for the monitoring and maintenance of mitigation, and to identify the funding mechanism for these activities.

All dry-weather flow and first-flush⁴ stormwater runoff from the project's commercial, residential, and institutional land-use areas and roadways will pass through stormwater treatment devices prior to discharge to waters of the State. Additionally, natural vegetation to be planted in the main and tributary channels will constitute a passive stormwater treatment system. Dry weather and stormwater runoff from those parts of the City of Upland tributary to Basin A is

³ The entire project site has been divided into 21 different planning areas that provide specific limits on the number and type of residential dwelling units, architectural and landscaping guidelines, development standards and controls, environmental performance standards, clearly defined land uses, and essential development and infrastructure phasing.

⁴ The volume of runoff produced from the 85th percentile 24-hour runoff event, based on historical records.

covered separately under the San Bernardino County municipal stormwater system (MS4) permit, in which the City of Upland is a co-permittee. For the period of construction only, the discharger has obtained coverage under the State Board's General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities, Order No. 99-08-DWQ.

An estimated 520,000 cubic yards of waste, including concrete, asphalt, tires, paint, oil, plastic, and construction material, was previously disposed of illegally at the site by others during the previous 20 years, prior to ownership of the site by the project proponent. The discharger has submitted a proposed Debris Removal Plan whereby this waste will be removed for proper disposal. Clean concrete and boulders will be recovered from the debris, crushed, combined with clean, on-site materials, and reused for fill. This Order requires the implementation of this Plan. Confirmation sampling of this remediated area is required by Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R8-2003-0025.

Order No. R8-2003-0025 should be adequate to protect beneficial uses and to assure appropriate mitigation of impacts to waters of the state.

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Order No. R8-2003-0025 as presented.

Comments were solicited from the following agencies and parties:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Regulatory Branch – Robert Smith
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad – Loren Hays
State Water Resources Control Board, Office of the Chief Counsel – Jorge Leon
State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality – Jim Maughan
State Water Resources Control Board, DWQ, Water Quality Certification Unit – Oscar Balaguer
State Department of Health Services - San Bernardino
State Department of Water Resources, Glendale/ – Anna Kolakowski (Sacramento)
State Department of Fish and Game, Los Alamitos – Robin Malone-Ramos
San Bernardino County Dept. of Public Works, Flood Control/Permits – Naresh Varma
San Bernardino County Dept. of Environmental Health Services, LEA Chief – Jacquie Adams
City of Upland – Rob Turner/Michael Thornton
San Antonio Water Company, Upland – Ray Wellington, General Manager
Cucamonga County Water District, Rancho Cucamonga– Robert DeLoach, General Manager
Chino Basin Watermaster - John V. Rossi, Chief Executive Officer
McPeters, McAlearney, Shimoff, & Hat, Redlands – Lisa DeBenedet
Law Offices of Susan M. Trager, Irvine – Susan M. Trager/Francis D. Logan, Jr.
Pitassi Architects, Inc., Rancho Cucamonga – Peter J. Pitassi, President
LSA Associates, Inc., Riverside – Jack Easton
Orange County Coastkeeper – Garry Brown
Lawyers for Clean Water c/o San Francisco Baykeeper
Natural Resource Defense Council- David Beckman
Center for Biological Diversity

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region

Order No. R8-2003-0025

Waste Discharge Requirements

For

The Colonies Partners, LP
The Colonies at San Antonio Project
Campus Avenue at 19th Street
Upland, San Bernardino County

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (hereinafter Board), finds that:

1. The Colonies Partners, LP (hereinafter, discharger) proposes to complete construction of "The Colonies at San Antonio" in the City of Upland, San Bernardino County (N34° 07', W117°, 37'). The project is a mixed-use development that encompasses approximately 450 acres and includes a combination of single family residences, luxury attached dwellings, neighborhood and commercial facilities, roadways, drainage and flood control features, and open space.
2. On June 4, 1999, Board staff waived waste discharge requirements and Clean Water Act Section 401 certification, with conditions, for the first phase of the project in its easternmost portion. This proposed Order prescribes waste discharge requirements for fill activities that have been and will be conducted during the second and final phase of the project. These fill activities have affected and will affect beneficial uses of isolated surface waters, which are waters of the state but are currently considered outside the jurisdiction of the U.S Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). Therefore, a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit is not being required by the ACOE, and no Section 401 water quality standards certification is necessary.
3. The project site is bounded by the Holiday Rock gravel mining operation located immediately to the north of the 210 Freeway; by Colonies Parkway and Tanglewood Avenue to the east; by Campus Avenue to the west; and by residences and a golf course to the south. An east-west arterial road, 19th Street, currently bisects the site into northern and southern portions. South of 19th Street, sand and gravel mining activities took place in two major pits separated by an earthen levee. The largest pit, located on the north side of the levee, is referred to as Basin 6 and the pit on the south side of the levee is referred to as Basin 7.

4. The site overlies the Cucamonga Groundwater Subbasin, which is used as a source of supply by water purveyors, including the Cucamonga County Water District and the San Antonio Water Company. Asserting the existence and viability of certain easements on the site, San Antonio Water Company has diverted, and continues to divert, flows from San Antonio Creek to serve its shareholders. Surplus water is discharged by the San Antonio Water Company into Basin 6 for groundwater recharge purposes. These easements and the rights of the San Antonio Water Company to continue such recharge operations are the subject of pending litigation between the San Antonio Water Company and the discharger. Cucamonga County Water District, which has no easement to spread water but which extracts from the Cucamonga Groundwater Subbasin, has intervened in the pending litigation. A court hearing to resolve the litigation is scheduled for June 2, 2003. The results of this litigation may materially affect the final design of the project.
5. Storm and low-flow runoff from a 2,400 acre urban watershed (part of the City of Upland and unincorporated County of San Bernardino) and from a segment of the 210 Freeway also enter Basin 6 from the west via the 19th and 20th Street channels. This surface flow has enabled development of wetland/riparian habitat (including marsh and willow/mule fat scrub associations) and intermittent ponds. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) identified a total of 29 acres of wildlife habitat in Basins 6 and 7.
6. In order to develop the project, the discharger proposes to conduct construction activities throughout Basins 6 and 7. Some unauthorized grading has already occurred. Prior to October 2002, earth-moving activities took place within Basin 6 that impacted three to five acres of wetlands and associated habitat (and therefore beneficial uses of waters of the state), without prior notification of and authorization by the Regional Board. On November 5, 2002, to prevent further destruction of wetland resources on the site, Board staff issued an order to stop further work on the project.
7. Basins 6 and 7 are considered isolated waters of the State. While beneficial uses for these isolated waters are not specifically listed in the Basin Plan, the beneficial uses of the wetlands and other habitat types in Basins 6 and 7 that will be impacted by the proposed construction activities include wildlife habitat (WILD), warm freshwater habitat (WARM), groundwater recharge (GWR), and non-contact water recreation (REC2).
8. On December 10, 2002, the discharger submitted a report of waste discharge (ROWD) in order to obtain appropriate waste discharge requirements for all project activities at the site that could affect beneficial uses and to resume work on the site.

9. This Order proposes waste discharge requirements to address the impacts of the project on waters of the state, including all prior unauthorized activities, and it authorizes lifting of the stop work order and resumption of construction work on the project once requisite approvals are obtained. The final project¹ design now proposed by the discharger includes a dedicated open space area wherein mitigation for the impacts of the project on beneficial uses is to be implemented. The discharger proposes the construction of an approximately 60-acre basin (Basin A), superimposed over the existing Basin 6, that will include wetlands (Zone 1, approximately 12 acres), riparian habitat (Zone 2, approximately 13 acres), open ponds (2 acres), and native upland shrub vegetation (32 acres) (Attachment C1). Additionally, appropriate native vegetation, including riparian associations, is proposed to be established along the 8.5-acre, narrow corridor ("gooseneck") that will convey stormwater overflow from the developed open space area to an existing detention basin (Basin B) adjacent to Cucamonga Creek. Basin A will also be used for flood control purposes by the County of San Bernardino Flood Control District. The discharger has committed to the completion of mass grading of Basin A by September 4, 2004. The discharger has also committed to the timely implementation, once mass grading is complete, of interim mitigation, consisting of vegetating the entire Basin with a range of species suited to the habitats to be included in the final basin design. The final design of the Basin, and implementation of long-term mitigation, are contingent on the final design and construction of the Basin for flood control purposes. The final design of the project is also contingent on the results of pending litigation. If the water purveyors prevail in their argument that their use of the site for groundwater recharge purposes must be protected, then the final design may need to be modified accordingly.
10. This Order addresses both possible outcomes of the pending litigation between the discharger and the water purveyors.
 - a. In the event that the discharger prevails, the Order requires the discharger to submit for approval by the Executive Officer a proposed plan and schedule for mass grading, fine grading and completion of the project, and the implementation of both short- and long- term mitigation.
 - b. In the event that the water purveyors prevail in the litigation, this Order requires that the discharger submit a proposed plan and schedule, for approval by the Regional Board, for mass grading, fine grading and project completion, and short- and long-term mitigation, that insures that any court-ordered directives regarding protection of the San Antonio Water Company's groundwater recharge rights are fully implemented.

¹

The entire project site has been divided into 21 different planning areas that provide specific limits on the number and type of residential dwelling units, architectural and landscaping guidelines, development standards and controls, environmental performance standards, clearly defined land uses, and essential development and infrastructure phasing.

- c. In either situation (11.a. or 11.b., above), the discharger is required to submit a proposed plan for the monitoring and maintenance of mitigation, and to identify the funding mechanism for these activities.
 - d. In either situation (11.a. or 11.b., above), the discharger is required to implement the approved plans, including the monitoring and maintenance of mitigation.
- 11. An estimated 520,000 cubic yards of waste, including concrete, asphalt, tires, paint, oil, plastic, and construction material, was previously disposed of illegally at the site by others during the previous 20 years, prior to ownership of the site by the project proponent. The discharger has submitted a proposed Debris Removal Plan whereby this waste will be removed for proper disposal. Clean concrete and boulders will be recovered from the debris, crushed, combined with clean, on-site materials, and reused for fill. This Order requires the implementation of this Plan.
- 12. All dry-weather flow and first-flush² stormwater runoff from the project's commercial, residential, and institutional land-use areas and roadways will pass through stormwater treatment devices prior to discharge to waters of the State. Additionally, natural vegetation to be planted in the main and tributary channels will constitute a passive stormwater treatment system. Dry weather and stormwater runoff from those parts of the City of Upland tributary to Basin A is covered separately under the San Bernardino County municipal stormwater system (MS4) permit, in which the City of Upland is a co-permittee. For the period of construction only, the discharger has obtained coverage under the State Board's General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities, Order No. 99-08-DWQ.
- 13. A Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) became effective on January 24, 1995. The Basin Plan identifies water quality objectives and beneficial uses of waters in the Santa Ana Region. The requirements contained in this Order are necessary to implement the Basin Plan.
- 14. The beneficial uses of the wetlands in Basins 6 and 7 that will be impacted by the proposed construction of the Colonies project are:
 - a. Wildlife habitat (WILD),
 - b. Warm freshwater habitat (WARM),
 - c. Groundwater recharge (GWR), and
 - d. Non-contact water recreation (REC2).

²

The volume of runoff produced from the 85th percentile 24-hour runoff event, based on historical records.

15. The discharge of fill to basins 6 and 7 overlies the Cucamonga Groundwater Subbasin, the beneficial uses of which include:
 - a. Municipal and domestic supply (MUN),
 - b. Agricultural supply (AGR),
 - c. Industrial process supply (PROC), and
 - d. Industrial service supply (IND).
16. This Order is necessary to address impacts of the fill to waters of the State and to meet the objectives of the State Wetlands Conservation Policy (Executive Order W-59-93). The goals of the California Wetlands Conservation Policy (Executive Order W-59-93, signed August 23, 1993) include ensuring "no overall loss" and achieving a "...long-term net gain in the quantity, quality, and permanence of wetland acreage and values...." Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 28 states that "[i]t is the intent of the legislature to preserve, protect, restore, and enhance California's wetlands and the multiple resources which depend on them for benefit of the people of the State."
17. Between 1997 and 2002, various surveys were conducted to inventory biological resources and to perform focused searches for threatened and endangered species. No threatened or endangered species were found, and a Biological Opinion is not required.
18. The City of Upland certified an environmental impact report for the project on September 24, 2002.
19. On November 12, 2002, CDFG issued a streambed alteration agreement for the project, including requirements for mitigation of the loss of the 29 acres of habitat in Basins 6 and 7³.
20. The Regional Board has considered antidegradation pursuant to State Board Resolution No. 68-16 and finds that the discharge is consistent with those provisions.
21. The Board has notified the discharger and other interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity for public hearing and opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.
22. The Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge.

3

As a matter of information, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) advised the discharger that due to embankment changes at Basin 6, the Basin is now under State jurisdiction for dam safety. Further, DWR advised the discharger that the dam was being operated and maintained without approval by DWR, a violation of Section 6077 of the California Water Code. The discharger proposes to rectify the violation by the construction of a new breach in the embankment, eliminating water storage.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the discharger, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, shall comply with the following:

A. DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS:

1. No activities associated with the project shall cause or threaten to cause a nuisance or pollution as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code.
2. The discharge of fill materials shall be limited to inert materials, as defined in Section 20230, Division 2, Title 27.
3. For soil samples from the pit bottoms and any fill to be emplaced, a saturated extract must indicate that:
 - a. Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) remaining in the soil do not exceed the following:
 - (1) TPH (Gasoline) - 100 mg/kg and
 - (2) TPH (Diesel) – 1000 mg/kg
 - b. Total threshold limit concentrations (TTLC) of priority metals do not exceed the concentrations (in mg/kg) specified in Title 22, California Code of Regulations Section 66699.
4. The discharge of any substance in concentrations toxic to animal or plant life is prohibited.
5. The groundwater in the vicinity of the project shall not be degraded as a result of the project activities or placement of fill for the project.

B. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS:

1. The discharger shall not conduct activities that would impact waters of the state until the plans required under Provision C. 2. and 3., are approved.
2. The discharge of wastes or pollutants that is not otherwise regulated by a separate National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to surface waters, or to any place where they would contact surface waters or be eventually transported to surface waters and flood plains, is prohibited.

C. PROVISIONS:

1. The discharger shall comply with M&RP No. R8-2003-0025. This monitoring and reporting program may be modified by the Executive Officer at any time during the term of this Order to include a reduction or an increase in the number of parameters to be monitored, the frequency of the monitoring or the number and size of samples to be collected. Any such modifications may be reduced back to the levels specified in the original monitoring and reporting program at the discretion of the Executive Officer.
2. If the discharger prevails in the current litigation discussed in Finding 4., above, the discharger shall submit for approval by the Executive Officer the following:
 - a. a proposed plan and schedule for mass grading, fine grading and completion of the project, and both short- and long- term mitigation. The proposed plan and schedule shall reflect the concurrent implementation of mitigation as the development proceeds, to the greatest extent feasible. The proposed plan shall also include a specific proposal whereby the discharger proposes to guarantee completion of all agreed-upon mitigation. This proposal shall account for the possibility of change of ownership of the site. The proposed plan shall be submitted by September 1, 2003.
 - b. a proposed plan for monitoring and maintenance of both short-and long-term mitigation included in the plan required by Provision 2. The proposed plan shall ensure monitoring and maintenance of vegetation and other devices/practices established for mitigation purposes for a minimum of five years after completion of the project. Proposed monitoring and maintenance practices, frequency, mitigation success criteria, and reporting shall be specified. The proposed plan shall identify the mechanism proposed by the discharger to assure funding for the proposed monitoring and maintenance activities. The proposed plan shall be submitted by September 1, 2003. This proposed plan may be submitted separately or as part of the plan required under Provision 2a.
3. If the discharger does not prevail wholly or in part in the current litigation discussed in Finding 4., above, the discharger shall submit for approval by the Regional Board the following:
 - a. a proposed plan and schedule for mass grading, fine grading and completion of the project, and both short- and long-term mitigation that insures that any court-ordered directives regarding protection of the San Antonio Water Company's groundwater recharge rights are fully implemented. The proposed plan and schedule shall reflect the concurrent implementation of mitigation as the development proceeds, to the greatest extent feasible. The proposed plan shall also include a specific proposal whereby the discharger proposes to guarantee completion of all requisite and agreed-upon mitigation. This proposal shall account for the possibility of change of ownership of the site. The proposed plan shall be submitted by December 1, 2003.

- b. a proposed plan for monitoring and maintenance of both short-and long-term mitigation included in the plan required by Provision 5. The proposed plan shall ensure monitoring and maintenance of vegetation and other devices/practices established for mitigation purposes for a minimum of five years after completion of the project. Proposed monitoring and maintenance practices, frequency, mitigation success criteria, and reporting shall be specified. The proposed plan shall identify the mechanism proposed by the discharger to assure funding for the proposed monitoring and maintenance activities. The proposed plan shall be submitted by December 1, 2003. This proposed plan may be submitted separately or as part of the plan required under Provision 3.a., above.
4. Upon approval by the Executive Officer, the discharger shall implement the plans required in Provisions 2. Any changes to the proposed plans shall be implemented only with prior approval from the Executive Officer.
5. Upon approval by the Regional Board, the discharger shall implement the plans required under Provisions 3. Any changes to the proposed plans shall be implemented only with prior approval from the Regional Board.
6. The discharger shall assure that all dry-weather flow and first-flush⁴ stormwater runoff from the Colonies at San Antonio development project site is appropriately treated prior to discharge to waters of the State. The discharger shall submit a Post Construction Water Quality Best Management Practices (BMP) Plan by September 1, 2003 for approval by the Executive Officer. This plan shall identify the measures to be employed to assure adequate treatment of dry-weather and first-flush flows, and that runoff flows from the development are not increased in amplitude, volume, or velocity from the pre-development condition. The discharger shall implement this plan upon approval by the Executive Officer.
7. The discharger shall maintain a copy of this Order at the site so that it is available to site operating personnel at all times. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.
8. The discharger shall remove from the site any waste or fill material found to contain substances listed as hazardous wastes or hazardous material pursuant to Section 25140 of the Health and Safety Code and shall dispose of these material at an approved disposal site. The discharger has submitted a proposed Debris Removal Plan. The discharger shall implement this Plan upon approval by the Executive Officer.

⁴ The volume of runoff produced from the 85th percentile 24-hour runoff event, based on historical records.

9. The discharger must comply with all of the requirements of this Order. Any violation of this Order constitutes a violation of the California Water Code and may constitute a violation of the CWA and its regulations, and is grounds for enforcement action, termination of this Order, revocation and re-issuance of this Order, denial of an application for re-issuance of this Order; or a combination thereof.
10. The discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.
11. The provisions of this Order are severable, and if any provision of this Order, or the application of any provisions of this Order to any circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other circumstances, and the remainder of this Order shall not be affected thereby.
12. The filing of a request by the discharger for modification, revocation and re-issuance, or termination of this Order or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any requirements of this Order.
13. The requirements prescribed herein do not authorize the commission of any act causing injury to the property of another, nor protect the discharger from liabilities under federal, state, or local laws, nor guarantee the discharger a capacity right in the receiving waters.
14. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort, or any exclusive privilege.
15. This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to, and approval by, the Executive Officer. The Regional Board may require modification or revocation and re-issuance of this Order to change the name of the discharger.
16. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facility presently owned or controlled by the discharger, the discharger shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be forwarded to the Regional Board.
17. The Regional Board, and other authorized representatives shall be allowed:
 - a. Entry upon premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the requirements of this Order;
 - b. Access to copy any records that are kept under the requirements of this Order;
 - c. To inspect any facility, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order; and
 - d. To photograph, sample and monitor for the purpose of assuring compliance with this Order.

I, Gerard J. Thibeault, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, on May 16, 2003.

Gerard J. Thibeault
Executive Officer

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region

Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R8-2003-0025

for

The Colonies Partners, LP
The Colonies at San Antonio Project
Campus Avenue at 19th Street
Upland, San Bernardino County

A. General Monitoring Requirements:

1. All sampling and sample preservation shall be in accordance with the current edition of *"Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater"* (American Public Health Association).
2. Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses shall be conducted at a laboratory certified for such analyses by the State Department of Health Services or at laboratories approved by the Regional Board's Executive Officer.
3. The total volumes of debris material separated from usable fill, for the purposes of disposal at separate municipal solid waste and hazardous waste landfills, shall be estimated and recorded in the permanent log. Hauling manifests and chain-of-custody receipts shall be filed with the permanent records and copies made available for reporting.
4. Aside from the determination of debris to be removed for landfilling, the following soil testing program shall be conducted:
 - a. Materials excavated from areas of the site known to have contained contaminated wastes and reclaimed for use in engineered fills or construction of approved mitigation facilities, shall be sampled at a minimum of one sample per 10,000 cubic yards, and analyzed for:
 - 1) Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH-Gasoline and TPH-Diesel using method 8015), and;
 - 2) CCR, Title 22 priority metals by total threshold limit concentrations (TTLC), by means of a saturated extract.
 - b. The final graded surface of engineered fills and approved mitigation facilities, shall be sampled at a minimum of three representative samples per acre and analyzed for:

- 1) Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH-Gasoline and TPH-Diesel using method 8015), and
- 2) CCR, Title 22 priority metals by total threshold limit concentrations (TTLC), by means of a saturated extract.

B. Reporting

1. A monitoring report shall be submitted on the 30th day of each month and shall include all information, including records from the permanent log referenced in A., above, collected in accordance with this Monitoring and Reporting Program for the previous month, including:
 - a. The estimated volume of fill material, in cubic yards, separated and hauled to landfills, stockpiled on site, and emplaced in the pits during the previous month. If no fill material is used during the reporting period, then a report to that effect shall be submitted in lieu of a monitoring report.
 - b. Hauling manifests and chain-of-custody receipts for hauled debris, including contaminated fill.
 - c. For every item where the requirements of the Order and this Monitoring and Reporting Program are not met, the discharger shall submit a statement of the actions undertaken or proposed which will bring the discharge into full compliance with requirements at the earliest time and submit a timetable for correction.
2. By September 30 of each year, an annual report discussing the following shall be submitted:
 - a. Description of project components completed within the year;
 - b. Discussion of mitigation measures that were completed during the previous year, including as-built plans;
 - c. Schedule for initiation/completion of remaining mitigation measures;
 - d. Description of any maintenance activities occurring within any mitigation areas; and

- e. A summary of changes made during the year to the Specific Plan, Streambed Alteration Agreement, Open Space Revegetation Specifications or other planning or regulatory documents prepared for the Colonies at San Antonio development project that effect, or have the potential to effect, the implementation of the approved Mitigation Plan, M&M Plan, or Post Construction BMP Plan for the project.
3. Any annual reports required by the approved Mitigation Plan, M&M Plan, or Post Construction BMP Plan for the project shall be submitted by September 30 of each year.
4. All reports shall be signed by a responsible officer or duly authorized representative of the discharger and shall be submitted under penalty of perjury.

Ordered by _____

Gerard J. Thibeault
Executive Officer

May 16, 2003

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

INDIAN WELLS
(760) 568-2611
ONTARIO
(909) 989-8584

LAWYERS
3750 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
POST OFFICE BOX 1028
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92502-1028
(909) 686-1450
(909) 686-3083 FAX
BBKLAW.COM

| | |
|----------------------|------|
| CRW | 4/23 |
| 2003 APR 22 AM 10:18 | |
| SAN DIEGO | |
| ORANGE COUNTY | |
| (949) 263-2600 | |
| SACRAMENTO | |
| (916) 325-4000 | |

JILL N. WILLIS
JNWILLIS@BBKLAW.COM
FILE NO. 04342.00056

April 22, 2003

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Mr. Gerard Thibeault, Executive Director
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region
3737 Main Street, Suite 500
Riverside, California 92501-3339

Re: The Colonies at San Antonio, Upland, CA - Draft Waste Discharge Requirements

Dear Mr. Thibeault:

We are writing on behalf of Cucamonga County Water District ("Cucamonga") and San Antonio Water Company ("San Antonio") to request that the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, exercise its discretion not to issue any permits relating to the Waste Discharge Requirements for the Colonies at San Antonio Project ("Project") located in Upland, California until the issues described below are resolved. The Project area has been used for groundwater recharge and storm water detention for more than fifty years. The Colonies Partners, L.P. ("Colonies") has owned the disputed property for less than seven years. Since that time, the Colonies has proposed a Project that could result in severe adverse impacts to groundwater resources and prevent historic recharge of the Cucamonga Basin.

1. Introduction

The Colonies initiated a lawsuit challenging the validity of certain reservations contained in deeds that allow San Antonio to spread water on the Project site for purposes of recharging the Cucamonga Basin. The lawsuit further challenges the validity of longstanding easements granting the San Bernardino County Flood Control District ("Flood Control") the right to occupy, construct, operate and maintain flood control facilities on the property. Cucamonga has intervened in the lawsuit because its right to extract water from the Cucamonga Basin will be substantially impaired if San Antonio is not permitted to replenish the Cucamonga Basin and historic recharge levels are not maintained. The lawsuit is scheduled for trial on June 2, 2003.

Mr. Gerard J. Thibeault, Executive Director
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
April 22, 2003
Page 2

San Antonio, Flood Control and Cucamonga strongly believe that the reservations and easements at issue are valid and that the Colonies must take appropriate measures to ensure the construction of permanent flood control and recharge facilities that will provide adequate recharge of groundwater to the Cucamonga Basin. Given the vast importance of the water resources of the Cucamonga Basin, and the Board's goal of protecting the beneficial uses of the State's waters, the Board should refrain from issuing Waste Discharge Requirements for the Colonies Project until the lawsuit challenging San Antonio's and Flood Control's rights are resolved.

2. San Antonio's and Flood Control's Rights to Spread Water on the Project Site

San Antonio's right to spread water on the Colonies' property arises from its prior ownership of the land now owned by the Colonies and from San Antonio's reservation of the right to spread water in subsequent transfers. San Antonio owned the disputed property until 1966, when it transferred the disputed property to San Antonio Land Company. A copy of the 1966 Grant Deed is attached as Exhibit "1." The relevant provisions of the Deed confirm that San Antonio reserved the right to spread water over the property. Specifically, paragraph 2 of the Deed reserved:

All existing works and facilities for the development, spreading and transporting of water now situated upon said lands hereby conveyed, including the rights at anytime or from time to time to use, operate, inspect, maintain, alter, improve, extend, enlarge, replace and remove said works and facilities ..

Similarly, paragraph 3 reserved:

All water at anytime lying, flowing or being in or on or under the land conveyed...provided that the reservation stated in this paragraph 3 shall not reserve to or confer upon San Antonio Water Company any right to use or do any act upon the surface of the land or within one hundred feet below such surface.

Flood Control's right to construct and maintain flood control works on the disputed property arises from a series of easements that San Antonio transferred to Flood Control, or its predecessor, the County of San Bernardino. The first of these easements was transferred in 1933, and the last of these easements was transferred in 1963.

For ease of reference, we have attached a chart summarizing relevant real property transfers that establish San Antonio's and Flood Control's rights with respect to the disputed property as Exhibit "2." In addition, the Colonies' Complaint in The Colonies Partners, L.P. v. San Bernardino County Flood Control District and San Antonio Water Company ("Title Case") contains the relevant easements granted by San Antonio to Flood Control and is attached hereto as Exhibit "3." San

Mr. Gerard J. Thibeault, Executive Director
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
April 22, 2003
Page 3

Antonio Lakes Partners, Ltd., the Colonies' immediate predecessor-in-interest, obtained the property in 1997.

By virtue of the above easements and reservations, San Antonio continues to receive the benefit of capture, conveyance and recharge of water from facilities located on the Property. Since 1966, San Antonio has been utilizing Basin No. 6, which is located in the middle of the Project site, to recharge the Cucamonga Basin. A final report issued by Wildermuth Environmental, Inc. indicating San Antonio's historic spreading in Basin Nos. 6 and 7 is attached as Exhibit "4." Historically, the average storm flow and San Antonio diversions into Basin Nos. 6 and 7 contributed an estimated 5,350 af/yr.¹

Similarly, Flood Control has consistently utilized the rights set forth in the applicable easements for flood control purposes. Moreover, Colonies has acknowledged the legal existence of Flood Control easements it challenged in the lawsuit. Specifically, on December 7, 1999, the Colonies entered into an Agreement with Flood Control regarding Phase I of the Project which admits that all parcels located within the Project area are encumbered by easements in favor of Flood Control. A copy of the 1999 Agreement is attached as Exhibit "5."

Taken together, the relevant easements and deeds, as well as the 1999 Agreement, firmly establish the rights of San Antonio and Flood Control to utilize the disputed property for flood control and recharge of the Cucamonga Basin.

3 The Water Agencies' Interests in and the Importance of The Cucamonga Basin

San Antonio's annual production from the Cucamonga Basin serves between 12,000 and 14,000 households in the Upland area. Cucamonga delivers drinking water to over 140,000 customers within a 47 square mile area, which includes approximately 40,000 water connections and 30,000 sewer connections for residential, commercial and industrial users. The Cucamonga service area includes customers in the City of Rancho Cucamonga, portions of the Cities of Upland, Ontario and Fontana, and unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County. The Cucamonga Basin is Cucamonga's primary source of groundwater production. Of Cucamonga's 23 production facilities, 17 of them are located within the Cucamonga Basin.

Since much of the natural groundwater of the Cucamonga Basin is contaminated, both Cucamonga and San Antonio depend and rely on recharge every year in order to provide their

¹ Although the primary focus is on Basin No. 6, it is important to note that the Project also adversely impacts Basin No. 7, which is located on the disputed property and is physically connected to Basin No. 6 through valves and pipes. Pursuant to the proposed Project, the existing Basin No. 7 will be completely filled in and developed.

Mr. Gerard J. Thibeault, Executive Director
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
April 22, 2003
Page 4

customers with a safe and reliable supply of drinking water. Historically, Cucamonga and San Antonio have used significant portions of the area proposed for development in the Project to recharge the Cucamonga Basin. The porosity and high conductivity rate of the soil enables the recharge water at the spreading basins to filter easily into the aquifer, making the land ideal for this purpose. Similarly, the area proposed for development has been utilized by Flood Control for the capture and detention of storm water runoff, which also provides recharge of the groundwater supply and protects hundreds of downstream properties from flood impacts.

Current rights to produce and export water from the Cucamonga Basin are set forth in a 1958 stipulated Judgment ("Decree") that resulted from a separate lawsuit brought by San Antonio against multiple water companies. A copy of the Decree is attached as Exhibit "6." Of the more than 20 water companies listed in the Decree, Cucamonga has acquired the interest of all except 3. As a result, and pursuant to the Decree, Cucamonga has an adjudicated right to produce 15,471 acre-feet of groundwater per-year, and to divert 3,620 acre-feet of surface water per-year from Cucamonga Creek. The Decree also provides San Antonio with a right to produce 6,500 acre-feet of groundwater per-year, contingent on spreading 2,000 acre-feet of water per-year.

At the present time, Basin No. 6 is one of the few active recharge basins in the Cucamonga Basin. Development of the land overlying Basin Nos. 6 and 7 into residential housing and commercial uses, as contemplated by the Project, would render large portions of this land impermeable and could preclude significant future groundwater recharge unless Basin No. 6 is designed in a manner that provides for historic levels of recharge to the Cucamonga Basin.

Cucamonga's groundwater production from the Cucamonga Basin depends on San Antonio's yearly recharge activities. If San Antonio is prevented from recharging the water, the Cucamonga Basin will be practically eliminated as a water supply due to the contamination of the existing water. Further, pumping only from the existing water supply, without recharge activities, will eventually deplete the water in the Cucamonga Basin.

Groundwater and surface water, which are both dependent upon adequate recharge, are Cucamonga's only sources of supply in this area. The only alternate sources of water are State Water Project water or Colorado River water, when available. If Cucamonga is forced to purchase imported water, a new treatment plant would be required. The capital cost for a new treatment plant could exceed \$35 million. In addition, imported water purchased from the Metropolitan Water District costs \$416 per acre-foot, which is significantly more expensive than Cucamonga's existing cost of approximately \$120 per acre-foot for groundwater. These increased costs would be passed along to customers through significantly higher rates. A copy of the Declaration of Martin Zvirbulis, which details Cucamonga's involvement in and concern for the Basin, is attached as Exhibit "7."

Mr. Gerard J. Thibeault, Executive Director
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
April 22, 2003
Page 5

4. The Colonies' Title Case and Related Litigation

In March 2002, the Colonies brought the Title Case against Flood Control and San Antonio. Essentially, the Title Case challenges the validity of Flood Control's and San Antonio's easements. Among other things, the Colonies seeks a declaration from the court preventing San Antonio from spreading water on the property for purposes of recharging the Cucamonga Basin, on the ground that the relevant property transfers did not reserve any such rights. The Colonies also seeks a declaration that Flood Control has abandoned and relinquished any rights acquired pursuant to the relevant easements described above.

If San Antonio is prevented from replenishing the groundwater in the Cucamonga Basin, Cucamonga's ability to extract water from the Cucamonga Basin will be severely impaired. Thus, Cucamonga intervened in the Title Case in an effort to protect its adjudicated rights and to ensure the preservation of historic recharge levels in the Cucamonga Basin. In light of these well-established legal rights and the importance of those rights, San Antonio, Flood Control and Cucamonga vigorously dispute the Colonies' challenge to the validity of the relevant easements and reservations, and the case is set for trial on June 2, 2003.

Cucamonga has also filed an action pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA" Case) challenging the City's approval of the Project. Among other things, the design of Basin No. 6 described in the Project's Environmental Impact Report does not provide for historic levels of recharge to the Cucamonga Basin and thus, does not effectively mitigate the Project's significant environmental impact to groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge. As a result, the Project reduces the beneficial use of the Basin and most local water wells due to higher concentrations of resulting contaminants and less recharge for dilution.

Further, the conditions of Project approval provide that the Colonies must complete a flood control system design in accordance with Flood Control's criteria to the satisfaction of Upland, that the ultimate design of the recharge facilities must be approved by Cucamonga, San Antonio, and Upland, and that the recharge facilities must be designed in a manner that preserves historic recharge capabilities. To date, attempts by the Colonies have failed to meet with the approval of Cucamonga, San Antonio and Upland. The Project cannot proceed until these conditions are met. A copy of the CEQA Petition is attached as Exhibit "8."

LAW OFFICES OF
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

Mr. Gerard J. Thibeault, Executive Director
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
April 22, 2003
Page 6

Given the above circumstances, issuance of any permits related to Waste Discharge Requirements for this Project would be very premature. Rather, prudence dictates that the Regional Board refrain from issuing permits related to Waste Discharge Requirements until the issues described herein are resolved, including the pending Title Case and CEQA Case. Please feel free to contact Gene Tanaka or me at (909) 686-1450 if you have any questions or need additional information.

Very truly yours,



Jill N. Willis
for BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

ET/JNW/tgl

cc: Robert A. DeLoach, General Manager, Chief Executive Officer
Cucamonga County Water District

Ray Wellington, P.E.
San Antonio Water Company

Ken Miller, Director
San Bernardino County Flood Control

Thomas H. McPeters, Esq.
McPeters McAlearney Shimoff & Hatt

Mitchell L. Norton, Deputy County Counsel
County of San Bernardino